DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 594 EA 021 089

AUTHOR Noddings, Nel
TITLE Developing Models of Caring in the Professions.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethics; *Feminism; Lawyers; Models; Nursing; *Professional Occupations; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Caring; Professionalism; *Theology

ABSTRACT

Much theoretical work is being done in relational ethics, particularly the ethics of care. Models of human caring are also arising within the professions. This paper discusses feminist contributions to theories of caring, focusing on the shared premises, conflicts, and paradoxes faced by four professions (law, nursing, theology, and education), which are moving toward the development of caring theories and models of practice. Evidence shows that feminist legal theorists and educators are trying to reconstruct law on a moral foundation that stresses caring and responsiveness; interest in caring models is driving the search for a new legal pedagogy. Today's nursing theory is similarly influenced by feminist theory and grounded on the concept of human caring. Like lawyers, nurses have not yet produced mature theories of professional pedagogy. Feminist theology, with its emphasis on experience and caring for living things and the environment, shares major assumptions and goals with feminist theorizing in law and nursing. Education evinces many of the paradoxes, premises, and conflicts appearing in the other professions. The ingredients for caring theories and models are there, but have not yet evolved into a powerful alternative theory of education. Three major difficulties are: (1) the devaluation of caring activities as "women's work"; (2) dominant traditional modes of thought and practice in schools; and (3) conflict among potential allies, such as humanistic educators. Ways to empower educational caring theories and models are discussed at length. Unfortunately, the very centrality of caring in teaching and nursing has contributed to the devaluation of both professions. (112 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308594

Developing Models of Caring in the Professions

Nel Noddings

Stanford University

Much theoretical work is being done today on relational ethics and, particularly, on ethics of care. Some of this work is directly derived from feminist theory, and all of it can be interpreted from feminist perspectives. In this paper, I will concentrate on feminist contributions to theories of caring in part because this is the literature I know best, and in part because space limitations prevent wider exploration. The work of Carol Gilligan (1982) in psychology, Nel Noddings (1984) in philosophy, Daniel Maguire (1978) in ethics, and Catherine Keller (1986) and Rosemary Radford Ruether (1983a; 1983b) in theology are all examples of the relational approach to social and moral theorizing. Further, models of human caring are arising within the professions. In all cases, there is a distinct move away from individualism toward relational modes and a new emphasis on professional/client relationships. This paper will discuss developments in law, nursing, theology, and education. I will not try to describe fully the content of models under development; that task would take far too much space. Rather I will outline main points and concentrate on the shared premises, the conflicts, and paradoxes that each of the professions faces in placing caring at its heart.

EA 021 089

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nel Noddings

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Law

Feminist theory is clearly having an impact on legal theory. In a recent article in the New York Times (Lewin, 1988), Geoffrey Stone, Dean of Law at the University of Chicago, calls it "the most interesting intellectual movement in law in quite some time," and Stephen Gillers, New York University School of Law, says, "It's a reconstruction of legal theory. Ultimately, we're going to feel it through an avalanche of a thousand little decisions." Feminist legal theory is pressing for a closer connection among law, justice, and care, and it has already suggested dramatic changes in tort law.

A central issue in any form of radical theorizing -- and certainly central in developing models of human caring -- is the power of language. Arguments about language appear in feminist legal theory as they do in feminist theory generally. Dale Spender (1980) and Mary Daly (1973; 1978; 1984) have argued that men have seized and kept the power of naming for themselves. The result has been that women are held to a male standard, encounter difficulty in articulating their own experience, and are simply left out of descriptions (and prescriptions) purporting to be universal. Leslie Bender (1988) discusses the "reasonable person" standard in tort law as an example of male naming and the implicit male norm underlying it. Noting that the standard was originally stated in terms of a "reasonable man," she suggests that the change in words -- from "man" to "person" -- does not eliminate sexism in the concept. If the generic use of "man"

failed to capture universal experience, so does "person" when the entire body of legal thought surrounding the notion of a "reasonable person" has grown out of male experience and been articulated by male theorists. Female experience simply disappears.

Arguing that verbal substitutions designed to eliminate sexism often perpetuate or embed it, Bender seeks an alternative that challenges the underlying model. She asks, "Should our standard of care focus on 'reason and caution' or something else?" (p. 22). Bender and several other feminist legal theorists (Frug, 1979, 1985; Minow, 1987; Rhode, 1988; Scales, 1988) suggest that care in the sense of concern and responsiveness should play a greater role in both law and professional education. Care as caution and prudence is typically a male orientation; care as concern and responsiveness has traditionally been associated with females. Challenges that attack fundamental notions such as the reasonable person standard clearly threaten the foundations of traditional legal theory.

In its current emphasis on care and response, feminist legal theory has been influenced by the work of Carol Gilligan (1982). This influence can be traced to at least two interests that Gilligan and legal theorists hold in common: abortion and moral theory. Feminist legal theorists have been deeply involved in issues of special concern to women -- abortion, child care, pornography, rape, sexual harassment, domestic violence, equity in the workplace (see Mac Kinnon, 1987) -- and they have also

been concerned about the moral foundations of law. Common interests led to a symposium (sponsored as the 1984 James McCormick Mitchell Lecture at the law school of SUNY, Buffalo) in which Gilligan, Ellen DuBois (a historian), and several legal theorists discussed feminism, moral values, and law. In this conversation it is clear that the renewed emphasis on relational feminism holds considerable attraction for feminist legal theorists. Carrie Menkel-Meadow, referring to Gilligan's (1982) description of Amy and Jake's moral thinking, asks, "What would the legal system look like if Amy had devised it, either alone or with Jake's help?" (DuBois et al., 1985, p. 53) Menkel-Meadow's question echoes a basic theme of contemporary feminist legal theory.

Feminists in the legal profession face several conflicts and paradoxes, and we will see similar conflicts and paradoxes in the other professions. First, there is the paradox of living and working within a system that one finds theoretically unsound and morally corrupt. Although feminists often agree with colleagues in critical legal studies (CLS) -- especially about weaknesses in the language of rights and the evils of hierarchy -- they are nonetheless forced to use the law as it is to improve the condition of women (Menkel-Meadow, 1988). Thus feminist lawyers argue for women's equity under existing law and at the same time press for massive changes in the grounding and spirit of law. This is a paradox that has to be accepted and lived, but it leads also to a conflict. Theorists in CLS are, in many ways, natural

allies for feminist theorists, but their criticism is cast at the level of concepts and abstraction, whereas feminists work from the experience of oppression and feel obligated to end it in practical political efforts. There is, therefore, considerable tension between the two groups.

Another group of potential allies -- humanistic legal educators -- are also in some conflict with feminism. Because feminists have produced devastating critiques of humanism and liberal education (Rich, 1979), feminist legal educators draw directly on feminist theory rather than humanistic education for a new pedagogy. The difficulty here seems to be that "humanistic" sounds as though it belongs solidly to the class of things associated with traditional humanism, and feminists have perhaps been too quick to lump all these positions into one solid symbol of patriarchy. The recommendations of feminist legal educators are, however, strikingly similar to those of humanistic legal educators (see, for example, Dvorkin, Himmelstein, & Lesnick, 1981).

Feminist pedagogy involves a shift from teacher to students as the center of attention; openness and dialogue; student-to-student talk; increased participation of students in the choice of questions, topics, and projects; more opportunities for direct contact in the field; variable modes of evaluation; more generous and direct help in learning; and a reluctance to grade on the basis of "natural" talent or test scores. Feminist law professors have begun to examine some of these issues with

respect to law classrooms (Hantzis, 1988; Jaff, 1986; Pickard, 1983; Wildman, 1988).

In sum there is evidence that feminist legal theorists and educators are attempting to reconstruct law on a moral foundation that makes caring and response central, and interest in models of caring is driving the search for a new legal pedagogy. This work, like that in the other professions under consideration, is being conducted in an environment of paradox and conflict.

Nursing

Nineteenth century conceptions of professionalism emphasized a dimension of altruism and service. Indeed commitment to service lay at the heart of professionalism, and even today professions formally espouse a dedication to their clients (Greenwood, 1957; Larson, 1977). But this century has seen a shift to power and privilege as the earmarks of professionalism (Larson, 1977). With the pursuit of power and prestige, professions have taken on characteristics inimical to service: hierarchies of power, less and less direct contact between professional and client, highly specialized languages, great monetary expenditures required in preparatory education, an increase in internal talk as contrasted to interaction with the larger community, and an overall exclusivity marked by racism, sexism, and classism (Sykes, 1987).

Nurses have rarely shown interest in becoming this sort of profession despite considerable pressure to do so. Today nursing theorists, influenced by feminism and the intrinsic demands of nursing, are involved in sophisticated projects to define nursing and nurse education in a way that maintains human caring as their central mission. Can a feisty "semi-profession" (Etzioni, 1969) define itself in a way that rejects major features of existing professions and still become a profession? This is the conflict nurses face.

Nursing theory today is frankly influenced by feminist theory (see Caring and Nursing: Explorations in the feminist perspectives, 1988). Central in its development is the concept of human caring (Gaut, 1979; Leininger, 1984; Watson, 1979, 1985). Nurse theorists like Watson, Gaut, and Leininger emphasize the importance of relatedness and responsiveness in caring. Watson states as a basic assumption for the science of caring in nursing that "caring can be effectively demonstrated and practiced only interpersonally" (1985, p. 8). This assumption contrasts sharply with the medical model's assumption that caring can be accomplished through technical means (see Watson, 1985). Nurse theorists do not reject the medical model in its entirety; they endorse technical competence and the use of medical technology. But they strongly deny the completeness of the medical model and its centrality to nursing. For nurses, patients must be persons, and the nurse must attend to personal,

emotional, and even spiritual needs as these are revealed in their interactions with patients.

Conflict between the models of caring and medical science extends into nursing education. Here, too, technical models have been valued more highly than caring, and nurse educators have followed the trend set in other professions -- to require more years of training and to equate technical competence with nursing itself (Reverby, 1987). But changes are appearing. Papers have recently been presented on caring in nursing education (Sheston, 1988) and caring for nurses (Brockman, 1988; Keen, 1988). Watson's (1979, 1985) texts are frankly metaphysical and humanistic and draw important distinctions between medical science and the human caring central to nursing.

Nurse educators are also showing interest in feminist epistemologies and ways of knowing (Belenky et al., 1986; Harding & Hintikka, 1983). Blending recent feminist ideas with work on ways of knowing in nursing (Carper, 1978), Jacobs and Chinn (1987) have presented a model of nursing knowledge that draws on feminism, humanism, and nursing experience. Virginia Knowlden (1988), building on the work of Gilligan and Belenky et al., has presented research that describes nurse caring as constructed knowledge.

There is also considerable interest in qualitative studies both in research (Chaska, 1978; Leininger, 1984) and teaching (Crowley, 1988). In the latter, feminist nurse educators are looking carefully at case studies in nurse training to expose

incidents of male domination (Roberts, 1983; Thompson, 1987; Yarling & McElmurray, 1986) and to encourage nurses to develop their own ethical ideals (Crowley, 1988).

In developing material for discussion of medical and nursing ethics, nurse educators are drawing on the work of feminist philosophers and ethicists (Hoagland, 1987; Houston & Diller, 1987; Noddings, 1984). Much of this work reflects the double concern about caring and the continued oppression of women, nurses in particular (Pence, 1987; Pitts, 1985; Veatch & Fry, 1987). Both Pitts (1985) and Yarling & McElmurray (1986) analyze a covert curriculum that socializes nurses to subordinate themselves and their ethical commitments to the authority of physicians. Taught formally to be patient advocates, nurses learn informally to remain silent even when physicians abuse patients (Crowley, 1988).

Nurse theorists have taken a courageous stand in affirming caring as the central concept in nursing. Drawing on their own experience, the history of nursing, humanist ideas in ethics and aesthetics, and feminist theory, they are beginning to build a coherent theory of nursing that is not subordinate to medical science. It is too early to predict whether nursing as a profession will survive the conflict it has joined, but its struggle is inspiring to all feminists engaged in the examination of professionalism. It will be interesting, too, to see whether its attempts to join forces with scholars in the humanities will help or hinder its drive toward autonomy.

Like legal theorists, nurses have also begun to think about feminist pedagogy. So far, pedagogies for nursing have concentrated on breaking free of oppression and remaining dedicated to human caring. Current interest in feminist epistemologies may eventually lead to full-blown feminist pedagogies, but at this time neither lawyers nor nurses have produced mature theories of professional pedagogy.

Theology

A model of human caring is also developing in theology. Feminist theology, like feminist legal theory and nursing theory, puts great emphasis on care, response, needs, experience, and the connection between forms of activity and ways of being in the world. In the introduction to a volume of essays in religious studies (Cooey, Farmer, & Ross, 1987), Sharon Farmer remarks on the considerable diversity of backgrounds and orientations represented in the collection of essays to follow.

> Yet despite these diverse backgrounds and orientations, our essays return again and again to two intimately connected themes: the embodied side of human nature and the relational side of community, divinity, and ethics (p. 1).

Farmer goes on to note that embodiment and relationality have been devalued in Western culture. Long associated with women, both qualities have been used as reasons to subordinate those who embrace them. Thus it takes considerable courage for

feminist theologians to affirm these interests and to suggest that a coherent approach to religion can be based upon them. Just as feminist legal theorists have received some support from Critical Legal Studies, feminist theologians have found allies in liberation theology. But, again, as feminists in law have had to assert important differences from CLS theorists, so feminist theology differs from liberation theology in scope and emphasis. Both represent exciting intellectual projects.

As evidence that a model of human caring is developing in theology, I would point to the following:

- the redefinition of key religious terms to include this-world as well as next-world meanings. Sharon Welch (1985), for example, defines "resurrection" to mean the provision of decent living environments and opportunities for all people here and now, in their embodied lives on earth.
- a sustained attack on hierarchy as a cornerstone of domination (Daly, 1973; 1978; 1984).
- an openness to the idea that representations of divinity are inevitably created in our image and that, therefore, the nurturing, caring qualities of females belong in the concept of deity. Distinctly female forms of divinity are posited (Christ, 1979; Downing, 1981).
- a pervasive emphasis on connection and relation in spiritual and ethical life. This includes powerful

critiques of separation as an evil induced by abstraction and over-reliance on the concept of sin (Keller, 1986; Noddings, 1989).

- a widespread interest in the connection between politics and spirituality (Spretnak, 1982).
- a careful analysis of women's religious history in order to untarnish, reclaim, and promote the qualities traditionally associated with women and, at the same time, to reveal admirable qualities (e.g. leadership, insight, courage) often denied of women (Ruether, 1974; Schussler Fiorenza, 1983).

An essential difference between traditional and feminist theologies is that, while both advocate neighborly love and compassion, the latter anchors its religious recommendations in human relationships of caring. It affirms exactly what traditional religion has often denied, namely that the connection between embodied persons can be a source of ethical life, joy, and spiritual justification rather than a source of sin and separation from God. In its emphasis on experience, on the direct, interpersonal activities of caring for living things and the environment on which we all depend, it shares major assumptions and goals with feminist theorizing in law and nursing.

Education

When we turn to education, we find many of the paradoxes, promises, and conflicts that appear in the other professions. The ingredients for theories and models of caring are there, but they have not yet been confirmed into a powerful alternative theory of education. All of the following have something to contribute to this enterprise:

- the direct analysis of caring and what it implies for moral life and education (Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983; Noddings, 1984).
- powerful analyses of related topics such as maternal thinking (Ruddick, 1980, 1989) and Hestian ethics (Thompson, 1986a, b, c).
- phenomenological analyses of basic life experiences and their bearing on education (Greene, 1973, 1986; Pinar, 1974, 1975; van Manen, 1982, 1984).
- the use of autobiography and narrative in both teaching and research (Grumet, 1980, 1988; Pagano, 1989; Traver, 1987).
- critiques of the liberal education curriculum that give appropriate attention to female experience, including care, connection, and compassion (Martin, 1981, 1982a, 1982b, 1984, 1985).
- neo-Marxist and critical theorists' sustained attack on oppression and its manifestations in educational

thought and practice (Apple, 1979, 1982, 1986; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Carnoy & Levin, 1985; Giroux, 1983).

- a tradition of humanistic education that has long opposed the overemphasis on cognitive and narrow academic goals (Eisner, 1979; Junell, 1979; Rogers, 1969).

Promising as these signs are, theories and models of caring are a long way from exerting effective influence on mainstream education. We already encountered one difficulty in building theories and models of caring in the discussion of nursing. All forms of direct, hands-on caring have long been considered "women's work" and correspondingly devalued by a male-dominated society. The conflict between caring and professionalization is an especially acute one, and I will return to it in my final discussion of caring and current programs for the professionalization of schoolteaching.

A second and obvious difficulty is the sheer power of traditional modes of thought and practice -- their domination of everyday school structures, of language, of political processes. This enormous power causes us at one and the same time to attack everything associated with it (Rich, 1979), use its structures to better our own condition (Edson, 1988; Menkel-Meadow, 1988), and argue incessantly with each other over feasible alternatives--often drawing on the dominant language to do this.

Feminist theorists in education are currently caught in a dilemma very similar to that of feminists in law. On the one

hand, many of us are engaged in intellectual attempts to overthrow and replace the basic concepts, premises, and goals of education. On the other, there is a strong tendency in individualist feminism (Offen, 1988) to demand equity in the very world others of us would overturn. Worse, even we -- relational or transformational feminists (people who oppose the current structures intellectually) -- participate in this demand, and most of us have decided that we will have to live with ambiguity and ambivalence for a long time.

A third difficulty, logically related to the two already discussed, is the conflict among potential allies. I certainly cannot do justice to that huge problem here, but I can point to some of its facets. Devastating feminist critiques of humanism and liberal education have made feminists wary of all contributions from "humanistic education." Feminists often ignore the striking similarity between humanist and feminist recommendations on pedagogy. The big stumbling block here is the long association of humanist programs with hierarchy, domination, and exclusivity. When humanistic educators fail to address these issues, feminists are reluctant to recognize any other of their recommendations. The problem here is similar to that faced by feminist theologians. Many of their prescriptions echo thoughts found in "pure and original" traditional texts, but the institutions that have flourished on these foundational thoughts have only given lip-service to them. The charge is hypocrisy,

and the recurring fear is co-optation and a new wave of domination.

Similarly, feminists have strongly criticized neo-Marxists and critical theorists for continuing to use "the very terms and prejudices of the system that they [attempt] to criticize" (Grumet, 1988, p. xiv). Mary O'Brien (1981) has argued that these theorists fail to recognize the hard work of women in caregiving tasks, and I (Noddings, 1989) have argued that these analyses entirely overlook the attitudes of love and care with which this work is often done and the beautiful, reciprocal relations between women and men that have developed despite pervasive economic oppression.

Given the existing and well-founded conflicts among potential allies, what can be done to empower our theories and models of caring? First, I think we should make cautious but generous attempts at rapprochement (there are signs of willingness to do this among neo-Marxists and critical theorists); second, I think we should continue to build models from our various theoretical perspectives but criticize each other constructively so that all useful perspectives are strengthened. In a post-epistemological era, we are aware that no theories will yield ultimate or absolute truth, and we all stand to gain as various standpoints are made clearer and better directed toward the improvement of relations among all living things. Third, we should bring our collective critical powers to bear on the pressing issues of contemporary education.

By way of example and because our general theme is caring in the professions, I want to close with an outline of a critique of current proposals to professionalize schoolteaching. Schoolteaching, like nursing, suffers from a conflict between two models of professionalism. The model of human caring now under development as a theory of nursing is similar to the model of commitment to children embraced by many schoolteachers. From this perspective, a "professional" is a good, caring teacher. But teachers are now hard-pressed to join the ranks of "true professionals," and this seems to involve a different form of commitment -- one that requires more hours on the job site, longer years of study, a visible drive to advance in a hierarchy, and some detachment from direct contact with students. All of these requirements are, or can be, at odds with models of caring.

In the wake of renewed concerns about the quality of American education (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), a movement has been initiated to professionalize teaching (Carnegie Task Force, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). Early critical reactions to this movement included doubts about the connection between professionalization and desirable effects for students. The question, still vitally important, was this: How is professionalization an answer to the problem of improving education for school children? This challenge did not come mainly from feminists (although it could have), and it is important to recognize that professionalization has been criticized by theorists other than feminists -- just as

legal theory has its critics in CLS as well as in feminist theory.

The main features of the Carnegie and Holmes reports are strikingly similar. Both recommend the establishment of standards controlled by the profession, an emphasis on graduate level professional training, and the creation of advanced positions in teaching (Sykes, 1987). The first recommendation has already been initiated in establishment of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, and work is underway on the development of prototypes for teacher assessment (Shulman, 1987). Reaction to this work raises serious questions concerning what teaching is about and the qualities that teachers must display to be considered good teachers (Wirsing, 1987). It also suggests concerns about the composition of the profession that will supposedly control its own standards (Freedman, 1988).

The Holmes Group's recommendation that the undergraduate education major be abolished is especially interesting. The recommendation is rationalized as a necessary part of professionalization (professional education in all respected professions is graduate education), even though present evidence suggests that elementary schoolteaching -- for which teachers are usually prepared at the undergraduate level -- is somewhat better than teaching in secondary schools which generally requires graduate level preparation. The Holmes' writers admit that, in the judgment of "most observers," teaching in elementary schools is "more lively, imaginative, and considerate of students"

(Holmes, 1986, p. 16) than that observed in high schools, but they suggest that weaknesses at both levels can be remedied by strengthening the liberal arts component of undergraduate education and locating most professional education at the graduate level. This decision to brush aside the judgment of "most observers" underscores the cogency of the objective cited at the outset: What is the connection between professionalization and better education for school children?

The third recommendation of the Carnegie and Holmes reports involves the establishment of career ladders or positions of advancement within teaching. Without such positions, it is argued, teachers who want to "advance" must leave the classroom for administration. With the introduction of advanced levels of teaching responsibility, teachers can have real careers in teaching. The Holmes Group suggests a three-tiered system: novices or instructors (who will work under the close supervision of professional teachers and can be licensed for no more than five years); professional teachers (who will hold masters degrees in teaching and will have passed various examinations in addition to those required for initial licensing as instructors); and career professionals (who will have fulfilled still more requirements and whose responsibilities will shift from direct contact with students to supervision, curriculum development, and other professional tasks). This recommendation, which introduces a new and rigidly defined hierarchy into teaching, raises a host of actual and possible objections from feminists.

Criticism of the Holmes Group's recommendations has been plentiful. One entire issue of the Teachers College Record (Spring 1987) was devoted to such criticism. Although several writers criticized the Holmes' prescription for hierarchy (see, for example, Conley & Bacharach; Darling-Hammond; Feinberg; Raywid), none of these critiques is explicitly feminist. The only feminist critique (Martin) concentrates on the important issue of rethinking liberal education.

However, in the same issue of the Record, Rob Traver (1987) takes a feminist perspective in his review of the third Handbook of Research of Teaching. He finds the voices of teachers and women both strangely missing from the Handbook's more than 1000 pages. His observation underscores the contention I made earlier that feminist theory, despite its impressive growth, has not yet greatly influenced mainstream educational thought. Traver calls for attention to feminist theory and also to autobiographical method which is eminently compatible with feminist methods. (See Biklen, 1983; Elbaz, 1983; Grumet, 1988; Spencer, 1986).

The dominant critiques of professionalization, like those of education in general, leave the basic structures intact. A main complaint against the dominant critiques is that they ignore women's experience and the centrality of human caring. They take for granted that people enter professions with an eye toward advancement in a hierarchy and power over others. Although neither the Holmes or Carnegie groups can be accused of accepting the old stereotypes of women as passive, lacking drive,

uninterested in intellectual work, and lukewarm in professional commitment (see Biklen, 1987), they do accept the masculine stereotypical notions of professional life. Hence, with no attention to the ways in which women work and divide their commitments, these reports are invitations to assimilate or get out of a profession that has long been occupied by women (Freedman, 1988).

There is considerable evidence that women teachers <u>are</u> deeply committed to their work with students (Biklen, 1987; Boston Women's Teachers' Group, 1983; Edson, 1988; Gilligan, 1982). Further, they do not see a sharp separation between their work as homemakers and teachers. They accept responsibility for the growth of others and derive deep satisfaction from their nurturing roles. The picture of deeply committed nurturers is very different from the earlier stereotype that was used as an excuse for women's absence in administrative positions. But it is still a picture that produces conflict in teachers just as it does in nurses.

The centrality of caring in teaching and nursing has contributed to the devaluation of both occupations (Freedman, 1988). But whereas nursing is attempting to hold its ground through the development of sophisticated models of human caring, teaching is giving way to the domination of scientific methods and a medical model of professionalization. If this domination is allowed to continue, women may indeed be "weeded out of woman's true profession" (Freedman, 1988).

One difficulty seems to be that, aside from the writers mentioned above, the powerful feminist critiques in professional education have not yet been focused on the professionalization of schoolteachers. The conflict is understandable. On the one hand, women teachers want to be professionals -- that is, they want to be recognized as committed, effective teachers (Biklen, 1987) -- but, on the other, they recognize that someone must do the caregiving in this society and they feel considerable anger when pressed to give up what they regard as central to their work. Their fear is that, in the new move to professionalization, teachers who move farther from actual contact with children will be regarded and rewarded as "more professional" than those who work directly with children. This is a potentially devastating criticism of the new recommendations.

Feminist critics evince great concern for children. It is not clear to them that the professionalization of teaching will benefit children. Their agenda would require beginning with families and children (Biklen, 1983; Grumet, 1988; Spencer, 1986). They might ask: How can teaching be restructured so that teachers who are parents can combine the two roles more effectively? Can we provide educational forms of childcare on school campuses? Can we arrange for flexible teaching schedules and partnerships that will allow men and women who wish to spend more time parenting to do so without losing professional status and opportunities? Can we provide more time for teachers to be

with their students, to develop caring relations, and make shared decisions with them? (Noddings, 1988). These questions represent a different perspective on teaching and on life than those raised by advocates of professionalization. They invite those interested in models of caring to describe what it means to be a professional from this alternative perspective.

References

Apple, M. W. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. W. (1982). Education and power. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. W. (1986). Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Belenky, M. F., B. M. Clinchy, N. R. Goldberger, & J. M. Tarule. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. New York: Basic Books.

Bender, L. (1988). A lawyer's primer on feminist theory and tort. Journal of Legal Education, 38(1&2), 3-38.

Biklen, S. K. (1983). Teaching as an occupation for women: A case study of an elementary school. Syracuse: Education Designs Group.

Biklen, S. K. (1987). Women in American elementary school teaching: A case study. In P. A. Schmuck (Ed.), Women educators: Employees of schools in Western countries (pp. 223-242). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Boston Women's Teachers' Group (S. Freedman, J. Jackson, & C. Boles). (1983). Teaching: An imperilled "profession." In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 261-299) New York: Longman.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Brockman, D. S. (1988, May). Nurturing the human spirit in the work place: Caring for the nurse. Paper presented at the Tenth National Research Care Conference.

Caring and nursing: Explorations in the feminist perspectives. (1988, June). Presentations at a conference sponsored by Doctoral Student Group and Center for Human Caring. Denver.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Carnoy, M. & Levin, H. (1985). Schooling and work in the democratic state. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Carper, B. (1978). Fundamental patterns of knowing in nursing. Advances in Nursing Science, 1(1), 13-23.

Chaska, N. (Ed.). (1978). The nursing profession: Views through the mist. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Conley, S. C. & Bacharach, S. B. (1987). The Holmes Group report: Standards, hierarchies, and management. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 340-347.

Cooey, P. M., Farmer, S. A., & Ross, M. E. (Eds.) (1987). Embodied Love. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Crowley, M. (1988). Feminist pedagogy: Nurturing the ethical ideal. In Caring and nursing: explorations in the feminist perspectives, pp. 300-317.

Daly, M. (1973). Beyond God the father. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1978). Gyn/ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1984). Pure lust. Boston: Beacon Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1987). Schools for tomorrow's teachers. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 354-358.

Downing, C. (1984). The Goddess. New York: Crossroad.

DuBois, E. C., M. C. Dunlap, C. J. Gilligan, C. A. MacKinnon, & C. J. Menkel-Meadow. (1985). 'Feminist discourse, moral values, and the law -- a conversation. Buffalo Law Review, 34(1), 11-87.

Dvorkin, E., J. Himmelstein, & H. Lesnick (Eds.). (1981). Becoming a lawyer: A humanistic perspective on legal education and professionalism. St. Paul: West.

Edson, S. K. (1988). Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eisner, E. W. (1979). The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan.

Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. New York: Nichols.

Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969). The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, and social workers. New York: Free Press.

Feinberg, W. (1987). The Holmes Group report and the professionalization of teaching. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 366-377.

Fiorenza, E. S. (1983). In Memory of Her. New York: Crossroad.

Freedman, S. (1988, May). Weeding woman out of "woman's true profession" -- A critical look at professionalizing teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Professors of Curriculum. Boston.

Frug, M. J. (1979). Securing job equality for women: Labor market hostility to working mothers. Boston University Law Review, 59, 55-103.

Frug, M. J. (1985). Re-reading contracts: A feminist analysis of a contracts casebook. American University Law Review, 34, 1065-1140.

Gaut, D. (1979). An application of the Kerr-Soltis model to the concept of caring in nursing education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Gilligan, C. J. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. (1983). Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. South Hadly, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Greene, M. (1973). Teacher as stranger. New York: Wadsworth.

Greene, M. (1986). Philosophy and teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook for research on teaching (pp. 479-501). New York: Macmillan.

Greenwood, E. (1957). Attributes of a profession. Social Work, 2, 45-55.

Grumet, M. R. (1988). Bitter milk. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Hantzis, C. W. (1988). Kingsfield and Kennedy: Reappraising the male models of law school teaching. Journal of Legal Education, 38(1&2), 155-164.

Harding, S. & Hintikka, M. B. (Eds.). (1983). Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.

Hoagland, S. (1987). Moral agency under opression: Beyond praise and blame. Trivia, 10, 24-40.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Houston, B. & Diller, A. (1987). Trusting ourselves to care. Resources for Feminist Research, 16(3), 35-38.

Jacobs, M. & Chinn, P. (1987). The whole of knowing: A model of nursing knowledge. Proceedings of the Western Society for Research in Nursing. Boulder, CO: Western Institute of Nursing.

Jaff, J. (1986). Frame-shifting: An empowering methodology for teaching and learning legal reasoning. Journal of Legal Education, 36, 249-267.

Junell, J. S. (1979). Matters of feeling: Values education reconsidered. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Keen, P. (1988). Caring for each other. In Caring and nursing: explorations in the feminist perspectives, pp. 272-299.

Keller, C. (1986). From a Broken Web. Boston: Beacon Press.

Knowlden, V. (1988). Nurse caring as constructed knowledge. In Caring and nursing: Explorations in the feminist perspectives, pp. 319-339.

Larson, M. S. (1977). The rise of professionalism. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leininger, M. (1984). Care: The essence of nursing and health. Thorofare, NJ: Slack.

Lewin, T. (1988). For feminist scholars, second thoughts on law and order. New York Times, September 30, B-1.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships and morality. Harvard Educational Reveiw, 53, 125-145.

MacKinnon, C. A. (1987). Feminism unmodified. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Maguire, D. C. (1978). The Moral Choice. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Martin, J. R. (1981). Sophie and Emile: A case study of sex bias in the history of educational thought. Harvard Educational Review, 51, 357-372.

Martin, J. R. (1982a). Excluding women from the educational realm. Harvard Educational Review, 52(2), 133-148.

Martin, J. R. (1982b). Two dogmas of curriculum. Synthese, 51, 5-20.

Martin, J. R. (1984). Bringing women into educational thought. Educational Theory, 34(4), 341-354.

Martin, J. R. (1985). Reclaiming A Conversation. New York and London: Yale University Press.

Martin, J. R. (1987). Transforming moral education. Journal of Moral Education, 16(3), 204-213.

Menkel-Meadow, C. J. (1988). Feminist legal theory, critical legal studies, and legal education or "The fem-crits go to law school." Journal of Legal Education, 38(1&2), 61-86.

Minow, M. (1987). Supreme court foreward: Justice engendered. Harvard Law Review, 101, 10-95.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, D. C.: GPO

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. American Journal of Education, 96(2), 215-230.

Noddings, N. (1989). Women and evil. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

O'Brien, M. (1981). The politics of reproduction. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Offen, K. (1988). Defining feminism: A comparative historical approach. Signs, 14(1), 119-157.

Pagano. J. (1989). The claim of philia. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theory discourses (pp. 514-530). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Skarisbrick.

Pence, T. (1987). Approaches to nursing ethics. Philosophy in Context: An Examination of Applied Philosophy, 17, 7-16.

Pickard, T. (1983). Experience as teacher: Discovering the politics of law teaching. University of Toronto Law Journal, 33, 279-314.

Pinar, W. F. (Ed.) (1974). Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Pinar, W. F. (Ed.) (1975). Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Pitts, T. (1985). The covert curriculum. Nursing Outlook, 33(1), 37-39, 42.

Raywid, M. A. (1987). Tomorrow's teachers and today's schools. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 411-418.

Reverby, S. (1987). Ordered to care. Cambridge, Eng: Cambridge University Press.

Rhode, D. L. (1988). Perspectives on professional women. Stanford Law Review, 40(5), 1163-1207.

Rich, A. (1979). On lies, secrets, and silence. New York & London: W. W. Norton.

Roberts, S. J. (1983). Oppressed group behavior: Implications for nursing. Advances in Nursing Science, 5(4), 21-31.

Rogers, C. R. (1969). Freedom to learn. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Ruddick, S. (1980). Maternal thinking. Feminist Studies, 6(2), 342-367.

Ruddick, S. (1989). Maternal thinking: Towards a politics of peace. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ruether, R. R. (1974). Religion and Sexism. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ruether, R. R. (1983a). Sexism and God-talk. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ruether, R. R. (1983b). The feminist critique in religious studies. In E. Langland & W. Gove (Eds), A feminist perspective in the academy (pp. 52-66). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scales, A. (1986). The emergence of a feminist jurisprudence: An essay. Yale Law Journal, 95B, 1373-1403.

Schmuck, P. A. (Ed.). (1987). Women educators: Employees of schools in Western countries. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sheston, M. L. (1988, May). Caring in nursing education: The development of a construct. Paper presented at the Tenth National Research Care Conference.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Assessment for teaching: An initiative for the profession. Phi Delta Kappan, September, 38-44.

Spencer, D. A. (1986). Contemporary women teachers: Balancing school and home. New York: Longman.

Spender, D. (1981). Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Spretnak, C. (Ed.) (1982). The Politics of Women's Spirituality. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Sykes, G. (1987, April). Teaching and professionalism: A cautionary perspective. Paper presented at Michigan State University.

Teachers College Record. (1987), 88(3).

Thompson, J. L. (1987). Critical scholarship: The critique of domination in nursing. Advances in Nursing Science, 10, 27-38.

Thompson, P. J. (1986a). Home economics and the Hestian mode. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 29(3), 87-91.

Thompson, P. J. (1986b). Beyond gender: Equity issues in home economics education. Theory into Practice, 25, 276-283.

Thompson, P. J. (1986c). Hestian hermeneutics. In L. Peterat (Ed.), The conversation and company of educated women: A colloquy on home economics education (pp. 79-87). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.

Traver, R. (1987). Autobiography, feminism, and the study of teaching (Review of M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan.) Teachers College Record, 88(3), 443-452.

van Manen, M. (1982). Edifying theory: Serving the good. Theory into Practice, 21(1), 44-49.

van Manen, M. (1984). Reflections on teacher experience and pedagogic competence. In E. C. Short (Ed.), Competence (pp. 141-160). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Veatch, R. M. & Fry, S. T. (1987). Case studies in nursing ethics. London: J. B. Lippincott.

Watson, J. (1979) Nursing: The philosophy and science of caring. Boston: Little, Brown.

Watson, J. (1985). Nursing: Human science and human care. Norwalk, CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Welch, S. D. (1985) Communities of Resistance and Solidarity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Wirsing, M. E. (1987). Holmes and Carnegie: The myth of bold new reform. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(1), 40-51.

Yarling, R. R. & McElmurray, B. J. (1986). The moral foundation of nursing. Advances in Nursing Science, 8(2), 63-75.